Florida Atlantic University

Center for Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (CWGSS)

Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Evaluation Criteria

1. The CWGSS PTR process will follow College and University guidelines and apply the departmental criteria listed below in determining ranking.
2. The CWGSS PTR Advisory Committee will consist of 3 members of the CWGSS Executive Committee at the rank of the candidate undergoing PTR. If necessary, faculty affiliates of the appropriate rank will be recruited to join the Advisory Committee.
3. The PTR file for CWGSS core faculty will include the following:
   1. A current curriculum vita that clearly highlights accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service during the period under review.
   2. Copies of the faculty member’s annual assignments and annual evaluations for the period under review.
   3. A copy of the report of the previous SPE or PTR, as applicable.
   4. A copy of these PTR criteria.
   5. A recent version of the NWSA’s official explanation of the nature of women’s studies, or another nationally recognized scholarly organization’s commentary on the field, to be provided by the faculty member in collaboration with the department.
   6. A brief (2 page) narrative from the faculty member.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The PTR process acknowledges that many kinds of work are only realized across multi-year arcs. Those faculty undergoing PTR may wish to highlight extended work in teaching, research, and service within their narrative.

**Teaching**

Exceeds Expectations

* The faculty member has the top two (2) ratings in the *teaching* category in 4 of the 5 annual evaluations under review
* The faculty member has demonstrated excellence in teaching through activities including those listed here. The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous teaching excellence:
  + Evidence of strong commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.), including participating in orientation events, First Year Reviews, and positive comments from the SPOTs
  + Two (2) strong Classroom Peer Reviews of teaching by faculty chosen by Director in consultation with candidate.
  + SPOT evaluations that consistently are better than 2.0 (this may include cumulative or averages, as well as selected student comments, as appropriate)
  + Committee membership/Chairing of Theses (Undergraduate and Graduate)
  + Supervision of Internships
  + Recognition of teaching (e.g. Departmental/College/University nominations or awards)
  + Commitment to Undergraduate Research
  + Curricular and program development
  + Service learning and community engagement

Meets Expectations

* The faculty member has one of the top three (3) ratings in the *teaching* category in 4 of the annual evaluations under review
* The faculty member has demonstrated a commitment to teaching through activities including those listed here. The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous teaching excellence:
  + Evidence of strong commitment to student engagement (availability to students, mentoring, providing academic guidance, etc.).
  + One (1) strong Classroom Peer Review of teaching by faculty chosen by Director in consultation with candidate.
  + SPOT evaluations better than 2.5 (this may include cumulative or averages, as well as selected student comments, as appropriate)
  + Committee membership/Chairing of Theses (Undergraduate and Graduate)
  + Supervision of Internships
  + Curricular and program development
  + Service learning and community engagement

**Scholarship**

Exceeds Expectations

* The faculty member has the top two (2) ratings in *scholarship* in 4 of the 5 annual evaluations for the period under review.
* Faculty member has an active and productive research agenda, with a new peer reviewed scholarly book in press or in print OR has three (3) of the following peer reviewed works in press or in print in the period under review: journal articles, book chapters, edited works, curated exhibits, films, and databases. They remain active in their field, presenting their research at local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia on an annual basis. Evidence of an active and productive research agenda:
  + Publication of peer-reviewed works, in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monograph, articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works, public history projects)
  + Research grants, book proposals, Series/Journal editorial work
  + Film or other significant and recognized creative activity
  + Active participation in local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.

Meets Expectations

* The faculty member has one of the top three (3) ratings in *scholarship* in 4 of the 5 annual evaluations for the period under review.
* The faculty member must have a demonstrated record of consistent and original contributions indicative of research/scholarly excellence, including development of an original monograph or at least two (2) scholarly works under peer review or in print. Faculty member participates in conferences/colloquia/symposia consistently. The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in assessing continuous research excellence:
  + Publication of peer-reviewed works, in traditional or electronic form (e.g., monograph, articles, book reviews, encyclopedia entries, review essays, edited works, public history projects)
  + Research grants, book proposals, Series/Journal editorial work
  + Film or other significant and recognized creative activity
  + Active participation in local/regional/national/international conferences/colloquia/symposia.

**Service**

Exceeds Expectations

* The faculty member has the top two (2) ratings in *service* in 4 of the 5 annual evaluations for the period under review.
* Faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence. The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in accessing continuous service excellence:
  + Chairing departmental, College, and University Committees and Initiatives.
  + Leadership positions/memberships in professional associations.
  + Advising on-campus student organizations.

Meets Expectations

* The faculty member has one of the top three (3) ratings in *service* in 4 of the 5 annual evaluations for the period under review.
* Faculty member must have a demonstrative record of consistent and meaningful commitment to service excellence. The following items are not intended to be a complete list but, rather, to serve as examples of the activities which may be taken into consideration in accessing continuous service excellence:
  + Serving on departmental, College, and University Committees and Initiatives.
  + Leadership positions/memberships in professional associations.
  + Advising on-campus student organizations.

**Across the Board**

Does Not Meet Expectations

* The faculty member’s performance of work-related responsibilities is not reaching the expectations set above and may be addressed through a Performance Improvement Plan. The areas of weakness must be documented and specified and must be related to the criteria above. No activities unrelated to work performance may be considered. Work performance must be assessed in dialogue with disciplinary norms and expectations.

Unsatisfactory

* There is sufficient documented evidence of the faculty member not adjusting work-related performance in response to annual evaluations to meet expectations that a Performance Improvement Plan would not be able to address the issue. No activities unrelated to work performance may be considered. Work performance must be assessed in dialogue with disciplinary norms and expectations.

**Other Criteria**

If applicable, the PTR File should also include documentation regarding the faculty member’s substantiated non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors’ regulations, and University regulations and policies within the scope of their University employment; documented evidence of unapproved absences from teaching assigned courses; and substantiated student complaints related to job performance. If needed, the unit head shall be responsible for adding these documents to the PTR File and assessing the impact of these documents on their recommended PTR ranking. The faculty member must be informed of these documents and must have access to the unit head’s letter and ranking.

The faculty member may include a response to the unit head’s letter and ranking. In that letter, they may choose to address the additional documents alleging substantiated noncompliance with relevant laws, regulations, and policies.

**Overall Ratings**

An overall rating of Exceeds Expectations requires an Exceeds Expectations in 2 categories and at least a Meets Expectations in the third.

An overall rating of Meets Expectations requires at least a Meets Expectations in all 3 categories, but does not meet the requirements for Exceeds Expectations.

An overall rating of Fails to Meet Expectations results from a rating of Fails to Meet Expectation in any category.

An overall rating of Unsatisfactory results from a rating of Unsatisfactory in any category